

Evening Telegraph

A DAILY AFTERNOON NEWSPAPER.

OFFICE NO. 108 S. THIRD STREET.

Price TWO CENTS PER COPY, or TWELVE CENTS PER WEEK, payable to "The Carter," and mailed to Subscribers out of the City at Six Dollars per annum; One Dollar per Two Months, payable in advance for the period.

Advertisements inserted at the usual rates. A liberal arrangement made for extended insertions.

To Correspondents.

We notice can be taken of American communications, which may be received by us, but must be authenticated by the name and address of the writer, and necessarily by the name and address of his mail route. We cannot undertake to return rejected communications.

To Advertisers.

Swing to the great increase in the Circulation of This Evening Telegraph, we earnestly request that advertisements may be headed in as soon as ten o'clock, if possible, to secure them an insertion in all of our editions.

SATURDAY, JULY 16, 1864.

ENGLAND AND THE DANO-GERMAN WAR.

If our people ever felt any apprehension that England would openly and directly interfere in aid of the South in its rebellion against our national Government, they may now well dispense any such fears from their minds. The action of the British ministry in reference to Denmark, proves most conclusively that they are afraid to go to war for any cause, even the honor of the Kingdom, and that no consideration of duty merely is strong enough to prevail against that pacific policy to which the British public and the British politicians are now quite unanimously and determinedly devoted. We learn by the last news from Europe, not only that Lord PALMERSTON, and Earl BURKE mean, very decidedly, to leave the Danes to their fate—to fight out their quarrel with the Germans without England's assistance—but that the opposition in Parliament, led by DEBENH AND DISRAELI, have concurred in the resolution.

This is certainly most discreditable to our English cousins, and we feel inclined to blush for so evident a decay of that bold and valorous spirit which anciently distinguished them. If ever one nation was bound to help another in a difficulty, England is solemnly engaged to aid Denmark at this time. This must be the verdict of the civilized world, and no special pleading will enable the British Government to get away from it. Even the Germans now taunt Englishmen travelling in their country with the cowardly course which their statesmen have pursued towards the Danes, while those into whose teeth such stinging charges are cast, can neither deny nor resent them. A Mr. HERBERT, one of VICTORIA'S subjects, and who has just published a book of recent travels on the continent, gives the following as the substance of conversations he had with various German friends of his during his journey. It will serve to show the contempt with which the German mind regards the treacherous and pusillanimous part which Great Britain has played in the Dano-German controversy. Mr. HERBERT thus reports what was said to him by Germans in Germany:—

" You in England have taken up a neighbor's quarrel—you have taken the cards out of his hands and played them for him—you have given him all that his antagonist asked—you have made him separately and severally concede every point demanded—nowhere is there a moment he refused to follow the course on which you led him. You have dictated his sacrifices which you have dictated; nor has he taken his cards back into his own hands until the last moment, when you yourselves have thrown them up, and have left him alone and friendless to meet his antagonist. Is not this literally your conduct? Is not this morally what you have done? I do not want to judge your conduct by what men think of it in Denmark—I am willing that it should stand on its trial in any court or company which you choose to nominate for it, as far as I am concerned, at Paris, at Turin, or anywhere else out of England you choose, you find but one opinion, and that of such a sort as would, could you bear it, disturb even your self-esteem."

This is a just statement of the case, and in view of it, we may well inquire why the British Government, and the British people of all political parties, have behaved in a manner so faithless to Denmark and so dishonorable to themselves. The reason is quite obvious. England has, by her dishonest course towards this country, richly earned the ill-will of our people, and she is afraid that the time may speedily come when we will properly resent the act that she has really, though covertly, given to the Southern Rebels in their efforts to destroy the unity of this nation. "Conscience," says "Hamlet," "doth make cowards of us all;" and England is at this moment a striking illustration of the truth of the remark. Her ministry are conscious of the ample provocations they have given us to seize the first plausible occasion to punish their criminal complicity with the Rebels, and it is that they destroy that feeling of security which is a result of the supremacy of the constituted authorities, and without which freedom is worthless. It is therefore for the general and ultimate good of the community, to submit to what appears to be an act of injustice on the part of the administrators of the law in a particular case, rather than countenance a resort to mob violence.

But, besides our duty to ourselves, we must not forget the mission of this Republic. In the Old World it is the constant plea for despotism, that men are not fit for self-government, and that there can be no security for society, unless the strong hand of an iron autocrat is holding the reins of power. The advocates of oppression point exultingly to the violent outbreaks of the people, whom a moderate degree of liberty was permitted, to support their assertions. Shall we, who often conclude that a defendant is criminal when subsequent events demonstrate beyond all doubt that the supposed guilty person was "more sinning against than sinning?" The best of us are liable to such prosecutions, and what assurances have we that, instead of having a fair trial, we shall not be torn from the Court by a mob and put to death without even time for prayer? Is it not clear that if we at once admit that "Lynch law" is fatal to the personal security of every citizen, if such outlaw proceedings are tolerated. Even the most profound jurists are frequently puzzled by circumstantial evidence, and they often conclude that a defendant is criminal when subsequent events demonstrate beyond all doubt that the supposed guilty person was "more sinning against than sinning?" The best of us are liable to such prosecutions, and what assurances have we that, instead of having a fair trial, we shall not be torn from the Court by a mob and put to death without even time for prayer?

The fact that a violent crew of ruffians undertake to decide a question of innocence or guilt under this "Lynch law" is fatal to the personal security of every citizen, if such outlaw proceedings are tolerated. Even the most profound jurists are frequently puzzled by circumstantial evidence, and they often conclude that a defendant is criminal when subsequent events demonstrate beyond all doubt that the supposed guilty person was "more sinning against than sinning?" The best of us are liable to such prosecutions, and what assurances have we that, instead of having a fair trial, we shall not be torn from the Court by a mob and put to death without even time for prayer? Is it not clear that if we at once admit that "Lynch law" is fatal to the personal security of every citizen, if such outlaw proceedings are tolerated. Even the most profound jurists are frequently puzzled by circumstantial evidence, and they often conclude that a defendant is criminal when subsequent events demonstrate beyond all doubt that the supposed guilty person was "more sinning against than sinning?" The best of us are liable to such prosecutions, and what assurances have we that, instead of having a fair trial, we shall not be torn from the Court by a mob and put to death without even time for prayer?

They destroy that feeling of security which is a result of the supremacy of the constituted authorities, and without which freedom is worthless. It is therefore for the general and ultimate good of the community, to submit to what appears to be an act of injustice on the part of the administrators of the law in a particular case, rather than countenance a resort to mob violence.

But, besides our duty to ourselves, we must not forget the mission of this Republic. In the Old World it is the constant plea for despotism, that men are not fit for self-government, and that there can be no security for society, unless the strong hand of an iron autocrat is holding the reins of power. The advocates of oppression point exultingly to the violent outbreaks of the people, whom a moderate degree of liberty was permitted, to support their assertions. Shall we, who often conclude that a defendant is criminal when subsequent events demonstrate beyond all doubt that the supposed guilty person was "more sinning against than sinning?" The best of us are liable to such prosecutions, and what assurances have we that, instead of having a fair trial, we shall not be torn from the Court by a mob and put to death without even time for prayer?

The destroy that feeling of security which is a result of the supremacy of the constituted authorities, and without which freedom is worthless. It is therefore for the general and ultimate good of the community, to submit to what appears to be an act of injustice on the part of the administrators of the law in a particular case, rather than countenance a resort to mob violence.

But, besides our duty to ourselves, we must not forget the mission of this Republic. In the Old World it is the constant plea for despotism, that men are not fit for self-government, and that there can be no security for society, unless the strong hand of an iron autocrat is holding the reins of power. The advocates of oppression point exultingly to the violent outbreaks of the people, whom a moderate degree of liberty was permitted, to support their assertions. Shall we, who often conclude that a defendant is criminal when subsequent events demonstrate beyond all doubt that the supposed guilty person was "more sinning against than sinning?" The best of us are liable to such prosecutions, and what assurances have we that, instead of having a fair trial, we shall not be torn from the Court by a mob and put to death without even time for prayer?

The destroy that feeling of security which is a result of the supremacy of the constituted authorities, and without which freedom is worthless. It is therefore for the general and ultimate good of the community, to submit to what appears to be an act of injustice on the part of the administrators of the law in a particular case, rather than countenance a resort to mob violence.

But, besides our duty to ourselves, we must not forget the mission of this Republic. In the Old World it is the constant plea for despotism, that men are not fit for self-government, and that there can be no security for society, unless the strong hand of an iron autocrat is holding the reins of power. The advocates of oppression point exultingly to the violent outbreaks of the people, whom a moderate degree of liberty was permitted, to support their assertions. Shall we, who often conclude that a defendant is criminal when subsequent events demonstrate beyond all doubt that the supposed guilty person was "more sinning against than sinning?" The best of us are liable to such prosecutions, and what assurances have we that, instead of having a fair trial, we shall not be torn from the Court by a mob and put to death without even time for prayer?

The destroy that feeling of security which is a result of the supremacy of the constituted authorities, and without which freedom is worthless. It is therefore for the general and ultimate good of the community, to submit to what appears to be an act of injustice on the part of the administrators of the law in a particular case, rather than countenance a resort to mob violence.

But, besides our duty to ourselves, we must not forget the mission of this Republic. In the Old World it is the constant plea for despotism, that men are not fit for self-government, and that there can be no security for society, unless the strong hand of an iron autocrat is holding the reins of power. The advocates of oppression point exultingly to the violent outbreaks of the people, whom a moderate degree of liberty was permitted, to support their assertions. Shall we, who often conclude that a defendant is criminal when subsequent events demonstrate beyond all doubt that the supposed guilty person was "more sinning against than sinning?" The best of us are liable to such prosecutions, and what assurances have we that, instead of having a fair trial, we shall not be torn from the Court by a mob and put to death without even time for prayer?

The destroy that feeling of security which is a result of the supremacy of the constituted authorities, and without which freedom is worthless. It is therefore for the general and ultimate good of the community, to submit to what appears to be an act of injustice on the part of the administrators of the law in a particular case, rather than countenance a resort to mob violence.

But, besides our duty to ourselves, we must not forget the mission of this Republic. In the Old World it is the constant plea for despotism, that men are not fit for self-government, and that there can be no security for society, unless the strong hand of an iron autocrat is holding the reins of power. The advocates of oppression point exultingly to the violent outbreaks of the people, whom a moderate degree of liberty was permitted, to support their assertions. Shall we, who often conclude that a defendant is criminal when subsequent events demonstrate beyond all doubt that the supposed guilty person was "more sinning against than sinning?" The best of us are liable to such prosecutions, and what assurances have we that, instead of having a fair trial, we shall not be torn from the Court by a mob and put to death without even time for prayer?

The destroy that feeling of security which is a result of the supremacy of the constituted authorities, and without which freedom is worthless. It is therefore for the general and ultimate good of the community, to submit to what appears to be an act of injustice on the part of the administrators of the law in a particular case, rather than countenance a resort to mob violence.

But, besides our duty to ourselves, we must not forget the mission of this Republic. In the Old World it is the constant plea for despotism, that men are not fit for self-government, and that there can be no security for society, unless the strong hand of an iron autocrat is holding the reins of power. The advocates of oppression point exultingly to the violent outbreaks of the people, whom a moderate degree of liberty was permitted, to support their assertions. Shall we, who often conclude that a defendant is criminal when subsequent events demonstrate beyond all doubt that the supposed guilty person was "more sinning against than sinning?" The best of us are liable to such prosecutions, and what assurances have we that, instead of having a fair trial, we shall not be torn from the Court by a mob and put to death without even time for prayer?

The destroy that feeling of security which is a result of the supremacy of the constituted authorities, and without which freedom is worthless. It is therefore for the general and ultimate good of the community, to submit to what appears to be an act of injustice on the part of the administrators of the law in a particular case, rather than countenance a resort to mob violence.

But, besides our duty to ourselves, we must not forget the mission of this Republic. In the Old World it is the constant plea for despotism, that men are not fit for self-government, and that there can be no security for society, unless the strong hand of an iron autocrat is holding the reins of power. The advocates of oppression point exultingly to the violent outbreaks of the people, whom a moderate degree of liberty was permitted, to support their assertions. Shall we, who often conclude that a defendant is criminal when subsequent events demonstrate beyond all doubt that the supposed guilty person was "more sinning against than sinning?" The best of us are liable to such prosecutions, and what assurances have we that, instead of having a fair trial, we shall not be torn from the Court by a mob and put to death without even time for prayer?

The destroy that feeling of security which is a result of the supremacy of the constituted authorities, and without which freedom is worthless. It is therefore for the general and ultimate good of the community, to submit to what appears to be an act of injustice on the part of the administrators of the law in a particular case, rather than countenance a resort to mob violence.

But, besides our duty to ourselves, we must not forget the mission of this Republic. In the Old World it is the constant plea for despotism, that men are not fit for self-government, and that there can be no security for society, unless the strong hand of an iron autocrat is holding the reins of power. The advocates of oppression point exultingly to the violent outbreaks of the people, whom a moderate degree of liberty was permitted, to support their assertions. Shall we, who often conclude that a defendant is criminal when subsequent events demonstrate beyond all doubt that the supposed guilty person was "more sinning against than sinning?" The best of us are liable to such prosecutions, and what assurances have we that, instead of having a fair trial, we shall not be torn from the Court by a mob and put to death without even time for prayer?

The destroy that feeling of security which is a result of the supremacy of the constituted authorities, and without which freedom is worthless. It is therefore for the general and ultimate good of the community, to submit to what appears to be an act of injustice on the part of the administrators of the law in a particular case, rather than countenance a resort to mob violence.

But, besides our duty to ourselves, we must not forget the mission of this Republic. In the Old World it is the constant plea for despotism, that men are not fit for self-government, and that there can be no security for society, unless the strong hand of an iron autocrat is holding the reins of power. The advocates of oppression point exultingly to the violent outbreaks of the people, whom a moderate degree of liberty was permitted, to support their assertions. Shall we, who often conclude that a defendant is criminal when subsequent events demonstrate beyond all doubt that the supposed guilty person was "more sinning against than sinning?" The best of us are liable to such prosecutions, and what assurances have we that, instead of having a fair trial, we shall not be torn from the Court by a mob and put to death without even time for prayer?

The destroy that feeling of security which is a result of the supremacy of the constituted authorities, and without which freedom is worthless. It is therefore for the general and ultimate good of the community, to submit to what appears to be an act of injustice on the part of the administrators of the law in a particular case, rather than countenance a resort to mob violence.

But, besides our duty to ourselves, we must not forget the mission of this Republic. In the Old World it is the constant plea for despotism, that men are not fit for self-government, and that there can be no security for society, unless the strong hand of an iron autocrat is holding the reins of power. The advocates of oppression point exultingly to the violent outbreaks of the people, whom a moderate degree of liberty was permitted, to support their assertions. Shall we, who often conclude that a defendant is criminal when subsequent events demonstrate beyond all doubt that the supposed guilty person was "more sinning against than sinning?" The best of us are liable to such prosecutions, and what assurances have we that, instead of having a fair trial, we shall not be torn from the Court by a mob and put to death without even time for prayer?

The destroy that feeling of security which is a result of the supremacy of the constituted authorities, and without which freedom is worthless. It is therefore for the general and ultimate good of the community, to submit to what appears to be an act of injustice on the part of the administrators of the law in a particular case, rather than countenance a resort to mob violence.

But, besides our duty to ourselves, we must not forget the mission of this Republic. In the Old World it is the constant plea for despotism, that men are not fit for self-government, and that there can be no security for society, unless the strong hand of an iron autocrat is holding the reins of power. The advocates of oppression point exultingly to the violent outbreaks of the people, whom a moderate degree of liberty was permitted, to support their assertions. Shall we, who often conclude that a defendant is criminal when subsequent events demonstrate beyond all doubt that the supposed guilty person was "more sinning against than sinning?" The best of us are liable to such prosecutions, and what assurances have we that, instead of having a fair trial, we shall not be torn from the Court by a mob and put to death without even time for prayer?

The destroy that feeling of security which is a result of the supremacy of the constituted authorities, and without which freedom is worthless. It is therefore for the general and ultimate good of the community, to submit to what appears to be an act of injustice on the part of the administrators of the law in a particular case, rather than countenance a resort to mob violence.

But, besides our duty to ourselves, we must not forget the mission of this Republic. In the Old World it is the constant plea for despotism, that men are not fit for self-government, and that there can be no security for society, unless the strong hand of an iron autocrat is holding the reins of power. The advocates of oppression point exultingly to the violent outbreaks of the people, whom a moderate degree of liberty was permitted, to support their assertions. Shall we, who often conclude that a defendant is criminal when subsequent events demonstrate beyond all doubt that the supposed guilty person was "more sinning against than sinning?" The best of us are liable to such prosecutions, and what assurances have we that, instead of having a fair trial, we shall not be torn from the Court by a mob and put to death without even time for prayer?

The destroy that feeling of security which is a result of the supremacy of the constituted authorities, and without which freedom is worthless. It is therefore for the general and ultimate good of the community, to submit to what appears to be an act of injustice on the part of the administrators of the law in a particular case, rather than countenance a resort to mob violence.

But, besides our duty to ourselves, we must not forget the mission of this Republic. In the Old World it is the constant plea for despotism, that men are not fit for self-government, and that there can be no security for society, unless the strong hand of an iron autocrat is holding the reins of power. The advocates of oppression point exultingly to the violent outbreaks of the people, whom a moderate degree of liberty was permitted, to support their assertions. Shall we, who often conclude that a defendant is criminal when subsequent events demonstrate beyond all doubt that the supposed guilty person was "more sinning against than sinning?" The best of us are liable to such prosecutions, and what assurances have we that, instead of having a fair trial, we shall not be torn from the Court by a mob and put to death without even time for prayer?

The destroy that feeling of security which is a result of the supremacy of the constituted authorities, and without which freedom is worthless. It is therefore for the general and ultimate good of the community, to submit to what appears to be an act of injustice on the part of the administrators of the law in a particular case, rather than countenance a resort to mob violence.

But, besides our duty to ourselves, we must not forget the mission of this Republic. In the Old World it is the constant plea for despotism, that men are not fit for self-government, and that there can be no security for society, unless the strong hand of an iron autocrat is holding the reins of power. The advocates of oppression point exultingly to the violent outbreaks of the people, whom a moderate degree of liberty was permitted, to support their assertions. Shall we, who often conclude that a defendant is criminal when subsequent events demonstrate beyond all doubt that the supposed guilty person was "more sinning against than sinning?" The best of us are liable to such prosecutions, and what assurances have we that, instead of having a fair trial, we shall not be torn from the Court by a mob and put to death without even time for prayer?

The destroy that feeling of security which is a result of the supremacy of the constituted authorities, and without which freedom is worthless. It is therefore for the general and ultimate good of the community, to submit to what appears to be an act of injustice on the part of the administrators of the law in a particular case, rather than countenance a resort to mob violence.

But, besides our duty to ourselves, we must not forget the mission of this Republic. In the Old World it is the constant plea for despotism, that men are not fit for self-government, and that there can be no security for society, unless the strong hand of an iron autocrat is holding the reins of power. The advocates of oppression point exultingly to the violent outbreaks of the people, whom a moderate degree of liberty was permitted, to support their assertions. Shall we, who often conclude that a defendant is criminal when subsequent events demonstrate beyond all doubt that the supposed guilty person was "more sinning against than sinning?" The best of us are liable to such prosecutions, and what assurances have we that, instead of having a fair trial, we shall not be torn from the Court by a mob and put to death without even time for prayer?

The destroy that feeling of security which is a result of the supremacy of the constituted authorities, and without which freedom is worthless. It is therefore for the general and ultimate good of the community, to submit to what appears to be an act of injustice on the part of the administrators of the law in a particular case, rather than countenance a resort to mob violence.

But, besides our duty to ourselves, we must not forget the mission of this Republic. In the Old World it is the constant plea for despotism, that men are not fit for self-government, and that there can be no security for society, unless the strong hand of an iron autocrat is holding the reins of power. The advocates of oppression point exultingly to the violent outbreaks of the people, whom a moderate degree of liberty was permitted, to support their assertions. Shall we, who often conclude that a defendant is criminal when subsequent events demonstrate beyond all doubt that the supposed guilty person was "more sinning against than sinning?" The best of us are liable to such prosecutions, and what assurances have we that, instead of having a fair trial, we shall not be torn from the Court by a mob and put to death without even time for prayer?

The destroy that feeling of security which is a result of the supremacy of the constituted authorities, and without which freedom is worthless. It is therefore for the general and ultimate good of the community, to submit to what appears to be an act of injustice on the part of the administrators of the law in a particular case, rather than countenance a resort to mob violence.

But, besides our duty to ourselves, we must not forget the mission of this Republic. In the Old World it is the constant plea for despotism, that men are not fit for self-government, and that there can be no security for society, unless the strong hand of an iron autocrat is holding the reins of power. The advocates of oppression point exultingly to the violent outbreaks of the people, whom a moderate degree of liberty was permitted, to support their assertions. Shall we, who often conclude that a defendant is criminal when subsequent events demonstrate beyond all doubt that the supposed guilty person was "more sinning against than sinning?" The best of us are liable to such prosecutions, and what assurances have we that, instead of having a fair trial, we shall not be torn from the Court by a mob and put to death without even time for prayer?

The destroy that feeling of security which is a result of the supremacy of the constituted authorities, and without which freedom is worthless. It is therefore for the general and ultimate good of the community, to submit to what appears to be an act of injustice on the part of the administrators of the law in a particular case, rather than countenance a resort to mob violence.

But, besides our duty to ourselves, we must not forget the mission of this Republic. In the Old World it is the constant plea for despotism, that men are not fit for self-government, and that there can be no security for society, unless the strong hand of an iron autocrat is holding the reins of power. The advocates of oppression point exultingly to the violent outbreaks of the people, whom a moderate